

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Upited States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/617,340	07/09/2003	Kirk D. Swenson	3896-030281	2750
26253	7590 11/16/2006		EXAMINER	
DAVID W. HIGHET, VP AND CHIEF IP COUNSEL			AHMED, AAMER S	
•	CTON, DICKINSON AND COMPANY ECTON DRIVE, MC 110		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
FRANKLIN LAKES, NJ 07417-1880			3763	
			DATE MAILED: 11/16/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summers	10/617,340	SWENSON ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Aamer S. Ahmed	3763				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION B6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 Oc	ctober 2006	•				
· _ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	action is non-final.					
· <u> </u>	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	•					
·	A pullo Quaylo, 1000 O.D. 11, 40	50 0.0. 210.				
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) <u>1-33</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) 3,8-10,13-16,22,25 and 31-33 is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) <u>1,2,4-7,11,12,17-21,23 and 27-30</u> is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) 23 and 26 is/are rejected.						
7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>24</u> is/are objected to.						
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.					
Application Papers	•					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.	•				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		Examiner.				
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		•				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	* * * *	• •				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		• •				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
,						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).				
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	•					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	• •					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior		ed in this National Stage				
application from the International Bureau						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	ed.				
Attachment(s)						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>05/19/2005, 10/14/2003</u> .	6) Other:					
						

Art Unit: 3763

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of Species D drawn to Figures 21 to 25, claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-13, 17-21, 23, 24 and 36-30 in the reply filed on 10/06/2006 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that claims 1, 23 and 27 are generic and that searching all embodiments would not induce an undue burden on examination. This is not found persuasive because there is still a burden of search on the examiner as searching the different track elements would require searching divergent fields. The examiner agrees that that claims 1, 23 and 27 are generic, however the election of species still stands.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 23,and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) or (e) as being anticipated by Thorne et al (U.S. 6,224,576).

Thorne et al discloses a method for blunting a needle assembly, comprising the step of bending or flexing an actuator (162, 168) within an opening through a hub (164) of a dual blunting needle assembly, thereby causing relative axial displacement between an intravenous puncture tip (100) and a first blunting tip (194) such that the

intravenous puncture tip (100) is blunted by the first blunting tip (194), and between a non-patient puncture tip (100') and a second blunting tip (158), such that the non-patient puncture is blunted by the second blunting tip; and the opening extends through the hub (see fig. 3) at least partially about a circumference thereof, and wherein the bending or flexing of the actuator (156) is achieved through circumferential rotation of the actuator about an axis defining the needle assembly within the opening (see fig. 3).

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-2, 5, 27-29 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-3 and 25 of U.S. Patent No. 6,855,128. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the patent does not explicitly disclose axial

Art Unit: 3763

displacement of the blunting tips, however it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to include axial movement of the blunting tips.

Claim 24 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-13, 17-21, 27-30 are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aamer S. Ahmed whose telephone number is 571-272-5965. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nicholas Lucchesi can be reached on 571-272-4977. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/617,340

Art Unit: 3763

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Page 5

A. Ahmed

RECEICLAS D. LUCCIESI

STEED TO STANKE THE STANKE